

**Appl. No. 09/818,074**  
**Amdt. dated December 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004**

#### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants received the Office action dated September 9, 2004, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boesch (U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,185); 2) rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Boesch in view of Collins (U.S. Pat. No. 5,848,159); 3) rejected claims 17-18 as being obvious over Boesch in view of Hori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,578,057); 4) rejected claims 11-12 as being obvious over Boesch in view of Collins and Hori et al.; 5) rejected claim 13-15 as being obvious over Boesch in view of Bergum (U.S. Pat. No. 5,457,748); and 6) rejected claim 38-39 as being obvious over Boesch in view of Hori and Bergum. The Examiner also concluded that claims 2-9, 16, 19, 21-37 and 40-43 contain allowable subject matter. With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1-3, 7, 17, 20, 28, and 38, and cancel claims 4, 19, and 21. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe all claims to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants amend independent claim 1 to include the limitations from claim 4 (which the Examiner concluded was allowable) and accordingly cancel claim 4. At least for the same reasons that the Examiner concluded that claim 4 was patentable, the Examiner should now conclude that claim 1 and all claims that depend from claim 1 are patentable.

Applicants also amend independent claim 17 to include the limitations from allowable dependent claim 19. At least for the same reasons that the Examiner concluded that dependent claim 19 was patentable, the Examiner should now conclude that claim 17 and any claim dependent thereon is patentable.

Applicants amended independent claim 20 to include limitations from allowable dependent claim 21. At least for the same reasons regarding the patentability of claim 21, the Examiner should now conclude that independent claim 21 and all claims that dependent upon thereon are allowable.

Applicants amend claim 38 to require that each of the requests include "a specified number of prime number values and a specified length of each of said prime number values." Applicants do not find these limitations in the art of record.

**Appl. No. 09/818,074**  
**Amdt. dated December 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004**

At least for this reason Applicants contend that independent claim 38 and dependent claim 39 are allowable over the art of record.

New independent method claim 44 requires "storing on a server a set of cryptographic parameters suitable for generating a cryptographic key; receiving a request from a client for a cryptographic parameter, the request comprising a specified cryptographic parameter characteristic; comparing the specified characteristic to a stored cryptographic parameter characteristic within the stored set of cryptographic parameters; providing the requested cryptographic parameter to the client if the specified characteristic matches the stored characteristic; and generating at the client the cryptographic key using the provided cryptographic parameter." None of the art of record teaches or suggests this combination of limitations. For example, the art of record does not disclose the claimed interaction between the server and the client. Accordingly, claims 44-48 are allowable.

New independent apparatus claim 49 is directed to a computer. The claimed computer comprises "a processor; and a memory coupled to the processor, the memory used to store a set of cryptographic parameters usable to generate a cryptographic key." The processor "receives a request from a second computer for a cryptographic parameter, said request includes a specified cryptographic parameter characteristic." The processor "provides the requested cryptographic parameter in response to the request." None of the art of record teaches or suggests this combination of limitations. Accordingly, claims 49-53 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

**Appl. No. 09/818,074**  
**Amdt. dated December 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004**

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris  
PTO Reg. No. 44,144  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400